CMP-SPRCM-76-1

SELECTIONS FROM PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA MAGAZINES

U.S AMERICAN CONSULATE GENERAL
HONG KONG, B.C.C.

JANUARY 12, 1976

U. I. C. C.
MAR 3 1976
LIBRARY

DISTRIBUTED BY:

NTIS
National Technical Information Service
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

KEEP UP TO DATE

Between the time you ordered this report—which is only one of the hundreds of thousands in the NTIS information collection available to you—and the time you are reading this message, several *new* reports relevant to your interests probably have entered the collection.

Subscribe to the **Weekly Government Abstracts** series that will bring you summaries of new reports *as soon as they are received by NTIS* from the originators of the research. The WGA's are an NTIS weekly newsletter service covering the most recent research findings in 25 areas of industrial, technological, and sociological interest—invaluable information for executives and professionals who must keep up to date.

The executive and professional information service provided by NTIS in the **Weekly Government Abstracts** newsletters will give you thorough and comprehensive coverage of government-conducted or sponsored research activities. And you'll get this important information within two weeks of the time it's released by originating agencies.

WGA newsletters are computer produced and electronically photocomposed to slash the time gap between the release of a report and its availability. You can learn about technical innovations immediately—and use them in the most meaningful and productive ways possible for your organization. Please request NTIS-PR-205/PCW for more information.

The weekly newsletter series will keep you current. But *learn what you have missed in the past* by ordering a computer **NTISearch** of all the research reports in your area of interest, dating as far back as 1964, if you wish. Please request NTIS-PR-186/PCN for more information.

WRITE: Managing Editor
5285 Port Royal Road
Springfield, VA 22161

Keep Up To Date With SRIM

SRIM (Selected Research in Microfiche) provides you with regular, automatic distribution of the complete texts of NTIS research reports *only* in the subject areas you select. SRIM covers almost all Government research reports by subject area and/or the originating Federal or local government agency. You may subscribe by any category or subcategory of our WGA **(Weekly Government Abstracts)** or **Government Reports Announcements and Index** categories, or to the reports issued by a particular agency such as the Department of Defense, Federal Energy Administration, or Environmental Protection Agency. Other options that will give you greater selectivity are available on request.

The cost of SRIM service is only 45¢ domestic (60¢ foreign) for each complete microfiched report. Your SRIM service begins as soon as your order is received and processed and you will receive biweekly shipments thereafter. If you wish, your service will be backdated to furnish you microfiche of reports issued earlier.

Because of contractual arrangements with several Special Technology Groups, not all NTIS reports are distributed in the SRIM program. You will receive a notice in your microfiche shipments identifying the exceptionally priced reports not available through SRIM.

A deposit account with NTIS is required before this service can be initiated. If you have specific questions concerning this service, please call (703) 451-1558, or write NTIS, attention SRIM Product Manager.

This information product distributed by

NTIS U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
National Technical Information Service
5285 Port Royal Road
Springfield, Virginia 22161

CMP-SPRCM-76-1

Selections from People's Republic of China Magazines

American Consulate General
Hong Kong

No. 854
January 12, 1976

This edition is printed in the United States of America for dissemination in the Western Hemisphere, Europe, the Mediterranean, and the west coast of Africa from material produced by the American Consulate General, Hong Kong. All queries concerning this edition should be sent to:

National Technical Information
Service (152.12)
U.S. Department of Commerce
Springfield, Virginia 22151

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

(Hsüeh-hsi yü P'i-p'an /Study and Criticism/)

Develop New Things Emerging from the Great Cultural Revolution - by Hung Li-hsin 1

Keep to the Road of Training Technicians from Among Workers 5

It Is Impermissible To Reverse the Verdict Passed on the Revisionist Line in Education - by Yen Feng 12

Read Lu Hsün's Thesis on Poetry - by Shih I-ko 16

Learn To Look at a Problem All-sidedly - by Fang Hai 21

PRICES SUBJECT TO CHANGE

Reproduced by
NATIONAL TECHNICAL
INFORMATION SERVICE
US Department of Commerce
Springfield, VA. 22151

Page

(Li-shih Yen-chiu /Historical Research/)

The Yaksa War Was China's Just War of Resistance
Against Tsarist Russian Aggression
- by Ch'ün Che 26

* * *

Unless otherwise indicated, these materials are full translations of articles appearing in People's Republic of China periodicals.

Develop New Things Emerging from the Great Cultural Revolution

by

Hung Li-hsin (洪立新)

(Hsüeh-hsi yü P'i-p'an /Study and Criticism/, No.12, December 14, 1975)

The great proletarian cultural revolution, initiated and led by Chairman Mao, has created and nurtured a large group of socialist new things. These include the extensive and sustained study by the people of all nationalities of Marxist-Leninist and Chairman Mao's works, the three-in-one combination of the old, the middle-aged and the young, revolutionary committees, the revolutions in literature and art and in education, the mass movements to learn from Tachai in agriculture and Tach'ing in industry, the departure of educated youth for mountains and rural areas, "May 7" cadre schools, barefoot doctors and the cooperative medical service, the mass Marxist theoretical contingents, and so forth. Like young shoots in the spring, these new things are growing luxuriantly and demonstrating their strong vitality in the socialist garden with a hundred kinds of flowers. These are victorious achievements of the great proletarian cultural revolution and the movement to criticize Lin Piao and Confucius, and are important hallmarks of the vigorous development of the socialist cause.

How should socialist new things emerging from the great proletarian cultural revolution be viewed? This is a major question of principle. The hundreds of millions of people who have directly participated in the great cultural revolution look at the socialist new things they themselves have created with joy and pride, while reactionaries both at home and abroad who safeguard decadent things fear and hate them. As the facts of class struggle show, the struggle over whether to affirm or negate the great cultural revolution will inevitably be reflected acutely on the question of whether to affirm or negate socialist new things. If we are to consolidate and develop the victorious achievements of the great cultural revolution, we must warmly support and actively develop the socialist new things that have emerged from the great cultural revolution.

Chairman Mao says: "All new things must experience difficulties and setbacks as they grow." This elucidates the universal law governing the growth of new things. When new things are just born, old things are always stronger than they in certain times, and these are common occurrences both in the world of nature and social life. Therefore, to surmount the stubborn resistance of old things, new things must undergo a difficult and tortuous struggle. While the reactionary class desperately defends old things, the revolutionary class ardently fosters new things. As historical experience shows, when new things grow sturdily, it is a sign that revolution goes forward smoothly; on the contrary, when new things are seriously maimed or die, it is an omen that the danger of restoration and regression is imminent. The socialist new things that have emerged during the great

cultural revolution represent the orientation for the advance of the proletariat and, as such, invite the extreme hostility from class enemies at home and abroad. A crucial manifestation of the ultra-Right essence of Lin Piao's counter-revolutionary revisionist line is its vicious denigration of the great cultural revolution and its attack on the socialist new things emerging from the revolution. The difficulties encountered by socialist new things in the course of their growth stem chiefly from the interference of the revisionist line and the sabotage of class enemies. The fact that revolution has not been carried out with thoroughness in certain spheres, that old things in certain fields still hold temporary advantage and that the old traditions and the force of habit still exert their influence has also brought difficulties to the growth of socialist new things. At times, our comrades, owing to their inadequate power of differentiation or lack of experience or to their shortcomings in work, may likewise hinder the growth of socialist new things. Both historical and contemporary experiences tell us that while it is not easy for young seeds of new things to break the earth and emerge in a great political revolution, it is still more difficult for them to grow and develop and certain setbacks are inevitable. If we are to foster and develop socialist new things, we must grasp class struggle as the key link, solemnly criticize the various fallacies which negate socialist new things, and help some comrades overcome their inability to understand or adapt to socialist new things.

All developing things are not perfect. Socialist new things emerging from the great proletarian cultural revolution must likewise undergo a process of development and continuous perfection. In our work, too, there is a process of gradually acquiring experience. Marxism holds that in looking at a problem, one must first look at its essence and main aspect. On no account must one take advantage of the immaturity and imperfection of new things and their secondary aspects, complain about and blame them. Take the revolution in education for example. The monopoly of education by bourgeois intellectuals was broken when the working class led the schools in struggle-criticism-transformation, when workers, peasants and soldiers were enrolled at universities, when worker-peasant-soldier teachers mounted the rostrum, and when schools were run with an open door. This has been a profound change on the educational front brought about by the great proletarian cultural revolution, and this is the essence and main mainstream. Today, however, a strange theory in the educational circles says that the educational revolution has done nothing good and its direction must be "reversed." It negates the working-class leadership over education. It slanderously charges that the quality of education has declined. It advocates "intellectual education first" (in effect, giving first place to bourgeois politics). It opposes training ordinary laborers with both socialist consciousness and culture. Above all, it writes off at one stroke of the pen the tremendous achievements made in the educational revolution. As the Mass Criticism Groups of Peking and Tsinghua Universities in their militant commentary "The Orientation of Educational Revolution Must Not Be Tampered With" pointed out: "The victory of the educational revolution is a vital component of the great victory of the great proletarian cultural revolution. At present, those who spread the strange theory in educational

circles attempt to reverse the verdict passed on the revisionist educational line and then negate the great cultural revolution and change Chairman Mao's revolutionary line. Revisionism is still the main danger at present. The debate on the educational front is part of the struggle between the two classes, two roads and two lines in society."* For another example, since the great proletarian cultural revolution began, leading groups at all levels have put into practice the principle of three-in-one combination of the old, the middle-aged and the young, and on all fronts large groups of new cadres have been selected and promoted to leadership positions. This has injected new blood and new strength into our cadre contingents. However, new cadres need time to grow and mature, and this requires that we place strict demands on them and provide them with warmhearted assistance. If we make light of the training and education of new cadres, take the attitude of an onlooker to their shortcomings and mistakes, feel pleased with their misfortune or even want to "beat them all to death with a bludgeon" at will, that is nothing but a manifestation of the bourgeois world outlook and cannot but harm the training of successors to the revolutionary cause of the proletariat.

Marxists are firmly convinced that socialist new things conform to the orientation of historical development, and thus always want to be seen to stand on the side of supporting socialist new things. In the course of their advance, new things inevitably encounter problems and difficulties of various sorts, entailing the need for us to positively carry out a tremendous amount of hard and meticulous work and from beginning to end share the destiny and breathe the same breath with socialist new things. If we do not actively participate in the revolutionary practice of nurturing and supporting socialist new things, we will not be firm in our stand of supporting them but will waver in a storm. Take, for example, the rustification of educated youth. The moment this socialist new thing appeared, it demonstrated its far-reaching significance in combating and preventing revisionism, narrowing the three major differences, restricting bourgeois rights, and bringing up millions of successors to the revolutionary cause of the proletariat. But, due to the sabotage of class enemies, the erosion of bourgeois ideology and the influence of old traditional concepts coupled with our lack of experience, some shortcomings and problems appeared in our work of sending educated youth to mountains and rural areas. The sturdy growth of this new thing has been assured over the past years only because the vast numbers of educated youth have stuck to the rural villages under the guidance of Chairman Mao's revolutionary line, because Party committees at all levels have strengthened their leadership and because comrades on all fronts have exerted common efforts and created a great variety of effective experiences of consolidating and developing the achievements of the work of sending educated youth

---

* For full text, see SPRCM No. 852.

to mountains and rural areas. In dealing with socialist new things which have yet to be improved, we should, as Lenin said, "have patience, endurance, determination and resolve and be good at carrying out repeated experiments and repeated improvements, and shall not stop until our goal is achieved."

Whether socialist new things should be affirmed or negated, supported or strangled, is a touchstone that distinguishes true Marxism from false. If we do not correctly solve the problem of understanding the great cultural revolution, we also cannot settle the question of attitude toward socialist new things. Chairman Mao had long ago portrayed the Right conservatives in these words: "When a kind of new things appear, they always disapprove of them and oppose them. Later, they would concede and make a little self-criticism. When a second kind of new things appear, they do so all over again according to these two attitudes. When later various kinds of new things appear, they also treat them according to this formula. These people are always passive; they always halt at critical junctures, and would take a step forward only when someone hits them hard on their backs." All of our revolutionary comrades must make an effort to transform their world outlook and strive to keep their thinking abreast of the objective situation of the rapidly developing revolution. Today, thanks to the great cultural revolution, the criticism of Lin Piao and Confucius and the presently developing study of theory and criticism of Water Margin, extremely favorable conditions have been created for the growth of socialist new things. The different attitudes adopted by people of different classes and strata enable us to see that the struggle over whether to affirm or negate the great cultural revolution is still continuing, a reflection of the struggle between the two classes, two roads and two lines. We must adhere to the Party's basic line, continue to fight for the consolidation and development of the victorious results of the great proletarian cultural revolution, continue to support and develop socialist new things, and unswervingly push the socialist revolution and construction toward new triumph!

* * *

Keep To the Road of Training Technicians from Among Workers

- Investigation of Shanghai Machine Tool Plant

(Hsüeh-hsi yü P'i-p'an /Study and Criticism/, No. 12, December 14, 1975)

On July 21, 1968, our great leader Chairman Mao, commenting on an investigation report "The Road of Training Engineers and Technicians As Seen from Shanghai Machine Tool Plant," affirmed the road followed by Shanghai Machine Tool Plant in training technicians from among its workers. He pointed out: "Universities must still be run, and here I refer mainly to universities of science and engineering. But the period of schooling must be shortened, a revolution must be carried out in education, proletarian politics must be placed in command, and the road of the Shanghai Machine Tool Plant in training technicians from among workers must be taken. Students should be selected from among workers and peasants with practical experience, and after a few years of study they should return to production." Six days later, Chairman Mao personally despatched worker and PLA propaganda teams to station in Tsinghua and Peking Universities and personally took charge of the educational revolution. Seven years have elapsed since then, and a brand new proletarian educational system, after all sorts of experiments, is being gradually established and consolidated. However, recently there has been a strange theory in educational circles saying that since the start of the great cultural revolution the orientation of the educational revolution "has never properly been settled" and that the educational revolution has gone too far and turned into a terrible mess. With a view to criticizing this erroneous tide of thought rejecting the educational revolution, we recently conducted an investigation of the Shanghai Machine Tool Plant.

Continuous Expansion of New-Type Worker-Technician Contingent

Persistently following the road of training technicians from among workers over the past seven years, the Shanghai Machine Tool Plant has trained more than 310 worker-technicians. At present, the proportion of engineers and technicians of worker origin has risen from 45 percent in 1968 to 65 percent.

Among this contingent of newly trained worker-technicians, 110 were graduated from the July 21 Workers University (ten have been sent to the interior to help with construction). The remaining 200 and more were trained through three-in-one combination /worker, technician and cadre/ in designing, mass technical innovation and technical transformation and other ways. Besides, more than 400-500 technical innovation experts emerged during the three major revolutionary struggles.

Most of these new worker-technicians do not detach themselves from production. Take, for example, the hundred graduates from the July 21 Workers University in the Plant. Seventy-two of them still work in workshops and undertake technical jobs while taking part in labor. The other

28 technicians who detached themselves from production still persist in taking part in labor in workshops, thus preserving the features of the working class. For instance, a graduate of the first graduating class was formerly a turner. On graduation, he was assigned to the axle sleeve section of No. 1 workshop, and has since handled seven kinds of work, doing what he was asked to do. Later, he was appointed a work supervisor, but he still did not detach himself from productive labor. When he saw that the moving of the spindle parts in the workshop was low in efficiency and great in labor intensity, he got the workers to design and make a mechanical hand. The masses praised him as an "all-round worker master." Such a technician is greatly welcomed since he breaks the boundaries between different kinds of work and the concept of gradation and does what the Party wants to be done.

This group of worker-technicians growing up in the course of the great cultural revolution are markedly different from old university graduates. They not only play a positive role in production and technical jobs, but also attach major importance to political-ideological work. An elderly worker student of the first graduating class of July 21 Workers University is the leader of the repair unit of No. 2 workshop. In the past he used to lose his temper and took an over-simplified view of work. The second day he returned to the unit after graduating from the University, he took the initiative to call on the comrades of his unit who differed with him for an open-heart talk, and sincerely exchanged opinions with them. Besides, he had the initiative of various quarters aroused through political-ideological work. A machine tool in the plant often leaked oil. The machinists and the operators blamed each other for the trouble, and no satisfactory solution was found to the problem. After inspecting it, he discovered that a screw cap on an oil tube had not been fastened tightly. Instead of simply fixing it, he called an on-the-spot analytical meeting. At it, he spoke of how waste was caused and made everyone see that to fasten a screw cap tightly, one must first "fasten tightly" one's thought, thus heightening everyone's sense of responsibility for the rear to serve the front. When he came across damaged parts in the course of repair, he would himself make a drawing and process the parts himself. After some machine tools were repaired by him, their structure was improved and degree of accuracy raised. The workers praised him saying, "When we talk about politics, he knows theory; when we talk about technology, he knows design; when we talk about production, he is a prime mover." There are many such technicians among graduates of July 21 Workers University in the Shanghai Machine Tool Plant. At present, 80 percent of them are members of the workers theoretical contingents, and 21 of them have become cadres who hold posts as shift and team leaders or higher posts. Most of the more than 30 machine tool design projects completed mainly by graduates of the first graduating class since 1971 have demonstrated their effectiveness. These include China's first fully automatic double end and face grinder, a large-size precision outside round grinder with a processed diameter of 1.6 meters, a dual-purpose crankshaft outside round grinder, and a cam grinder with digital process control. Also included are a 10-meter deep hole rolling depression grinder, a high-efficient double head boring and milling machine and other machine tools.

In this plant, new-type worker-technicians trained in July 21 Workers University and in other ways are both manual and mental laborers. An increase in the number of such people will go a long way toward restricting bourgeois rights and reducing the differences between manual and mental labor. At the same time, it will help reduce the number of technicians who are detached from production as some technical jobs may be done at the lower level. In the past, No. 2 workshop used a hand-pulled flat car in moving large parts. A lot of labor power was used and physical consumption was great. It was the desire of the workers to have it converted into an electric car. However, some technicians neither dared nor wanted to do this, saying that design for such conversion was "too simple" and "unprofitable." In fact, they thought that if they succeeded in making it, they would have no credit, and that if they failed, they would lose face. Thus for a long time nothing was done about this. A woman turner in this workshop, after mastering the design technique, took the initiative and completed the conversion task. Operating this electric car, the workers said proudly: This one is made by our own newly trained technician!

Impressive Changes in the Plant

Since the start of the great proletarian cultural revolution, the continuous expansion of the technical contingent of the working class in the Shanghai Machine Tool Plant has brought about profound changes in the superstructure and economic base of the plant, and the task of consolidating the dictatorship of the proletariat has been further implemented. This is shown mainly in the following respects:

First, the proletarian leadership in the plant has been further strengthened. Once, before the great cultural revolution, the state urgently requested this plant to design and manufacture a large grinder. But this request was brushed aside by certain leaders of the plant, who asserted that such a grinder had to be imported. In 1970, without any basic change in the equipment of the plant, the entire designing work on this large grinder was completed mainly by worker-technicians in 80 days, and it was manufactured in half a year. Its cost was only one-fourth of the import price. This shows that by persistently taking the road of training technicians from among workers and enabling more and more workers to become masters of science and technology, it will be possible to better implement Chairman Mao's revolutionary line and place the technical power of the plant firmly in the hands of the worker masses.

Second, the revolution in the sphere of the superstructure in the plant has been promoted. The growth of group after group of worker-technicians and the increase of the number of members of worker origin in the scientific research and technical design departments of the plant enable these departments to better satisfy the needs of the developing socialist cause. According to statistics, the grinder research institute of this plant undertook a total of 197 projects from 1968 to 1974, and of these 123 have been completed and 112 commissioned in production. But before the great cultural revolution, although there were a great variety of research projects undertaken, very few of them were actually applied to

production. In addition, 600-700 workers are part-time teachers in the plant's July 21 Workers University and participate in such teaching activities as providing counsel for design, taking the lead in actual practice, and compiling teaching material. Tempered in struggle they have become activists in the plant's struggle-criticism-transformation. That worker-technician mentioned in the 1968 investigation report has now become the secretary of the Party branch of the July 21 Workers University. Relying on the worker masses of the plant, the university has compiled teaching materials with a total number of more than 4 million characters. In this connection, the book Grinder Design and Manufacture has been published and distributed to the public. In the course of the teaching reform, they are brave in practice, have gained experience in the proletarian revolution in education, and made their contributions.

Third, the transformation of existing intellectuals has been promoted and the relationship between workers and technicians improved. By persisting in taking the "July 21" road, the Shanghai Machine Tool Plant has created the conditions for intellectuals trained in old schools to further integrate with the workers in the true sense of the word. Most of the existing 350 intellectuals in the plant have participated in productive labor continuously for about a year. Some of them have been working in shifts and teams for years and have progressed in different degrees. That "associate doctor" mentioned in the 1968 investigation report was so unhappy with that report at the time that she threw her pen on the desk. What about her now? Having labored assembling parts for nearly three years in No. 2 workshop, she has changed her thought and feelings considerably. In doing design work, she often goes to the workshop to canvass the opinions of the workers, seriously studies practical experience, and has scored definite achievements. She is hailed by the worker masses. The changes in the attitude of this "associate doctor" illustrate that most intellectuals who came from old schools and have been more deeply influenced by the revisionist educational line can transform themselves if they are encouraged to integrate with the worker masses in accordance with Chairman Mao's revolutionary line.

Fourth, production throughout the plant has been accelerated. In 1974 labor productivity of the entire force nearly doubled that of 1968, and profits delivered to the state were six times as much. For the last seven years, a total of 127 new products were successfully manufactured on a trial basis, equivalent to one and a half times those in the 17 years before the great cultural revolution. Among these, 64 were designed mainly by worker-technicians, equivalent to more than 3 times those before the great cultural revolution. China's first large crankshaft grinder, first large spiral grinder and many other key products were made after newly trained worker-technicians were appointed heads of three-in-one designing units following the publication of Chairman Mao's "July 21 Directive." In the past, influenced by the revisionist line on enterprise management, this plant rejected tasks to design and manufacture particularly large grinders. Now, encouraged by the worker masses, it accepts all tasks from the state and tries its utmost to fulfill them. The output of large machine tools in 1974 was three times that of 1968.

A Profound Ideological Revolution

Training technicians from among workers in pursuance with Chairman Mao's "July 21 Directive" is a major achievement of the great cultural revolution. Over the last seven years this and other achievements were made by the Shanghai Machine Tool Plant not without fierce struggle.

The publication of Chairman Mao's "July 21 Directive" confronted the plant with the question of how to adhere to the "July 21" road. The workers were determined to run a workers university by themselves in order to quicken the pace of training a workers technical contingent. However, opinions were divided over whether a plant should run a school. Some comrades who did not favor the idea put forward various reasons: The plant was not an educational unit; it did not have the conditions to run a school; and no school need be established because there were many technicians already. These views essentially resulted from the fact that the pernicious influence of the revisionist educational line had not been entirely eradicated as they also manifested the pernicious influence of the revisionist line on enterprise management. These views were rejected and opposed by the worker masses. The worker comrades said rightly that we must not only produce millions of grinders but also bring up millions of working-class technicians.

The practice of this plant shows that to run a school well, a plant must criticize the revisionist line on management. Take the liquid-pressure workshop for example. When it was conducting spare-time technical education for workers, some leaders regarded this as an "extra burden," and called for putting education and production in "separate accounts." As they saw it, several persons might be selected and given a free hand to run such education. But the result was that not only did education turn out to be a flop, but even production was also affected. The workers were critical,saying: Setting education against production was also a manifestation of the revisionist line on enterprise management. Urged on by the workers, the workshop leadership and everyone else studied again Chairman Mao's "July 21 Directive," criticized the theory that productive forces are everything, and came to recognize that only by unifying the training of men with the effort to boost production was it possible to better carry out Chairman Mao's revolutionary line and accommodate to the penetrating development of the revolution in an industrial enterprise. With heightened perceptions, the methods were changed. They linked the compilation of teaching materials with the summing up of production experience and the effort to raise the workshop's technical level. They linked the conduct of teaching in light of reality with the workshop's technical innovation activities. While fulfilling production plans, they studied the relevant technical knowledge. This resulted in a new atmosphere in the workshop. From 1970 to 1974, this workshop, relying mainly on its own strength, designed and manufactured more than 30 pieces of equipment for special use and realized more than 600 minor innovated items. Its production capacity rose three times compared with the highest level before 1968. The changes in this workshop demonstrate that to conduct education successfully, the plant must carry

out a series of directives issued by Chairman Mao concerning the educational revolution as well as carrying out a profound revolution in the plant itself.

Does training worker-technicians mean only studying technical knowledge? No. The experience of the Shanghai Machine Tool Plant is that proletarian politics must first be placed in command and great importance attached to the transformation of world outlook. If a plant does not insist on this from beginning to end, it will go astray. Some comrades think that with the problem of leadership of the plant already solved through the great proletarian cultural revolution, the one problem that remains is how to raise the technical level and design more products. This shows that the pernicious influence of the theory that productive forces are everything as spread by Liu Shao-ch'i and Lin Piao and company has not been completely eliminated. Facts show that while a worker with practical experience must master some technical theories, the more important thing is for him to be well versed in the theory of proletarian dictatorship. Take the case of a new worker-technician who relaxed his effort to transform his world outlook. When the organization asked him to take up an important assignment, he regarded his skills as a commodity and bargained with the Party. Historical and contemporary experiences show that if we care only for the straight line and the curve without carrying out the Party's basic line, the situation may still appear in which "skills are in hand, but men are snatched away." In training worker-technicians this plant has over the years persisted in placing proletarian politics in command, taking class struggle as the key link and political-ideological education as the central segment. It has unceasingly criticized such notions as "technology in command," "intellectual education first" and "private ownership of knowledge." It has overcome the tendency to stress vocational work at the expense of politics. It has striven to promote the practice of learning techniques for the revolution with more remarkable results.

In training a new-type worker technical force, it is also necessary to persist in "from production and back to production." Judging by the experience of the Shanghai Machine Tool Plant, while it is not easy to select workers with practical experience and send them to university, sending them back to production upon graduation involves a still more violent ideological struggle. Some comrades even say: "Why should one go to school for several years in order to become an ordinary laborer?" Such an approach is essentially a reflection in people's minds of bourgeois rights. The July 21 Workers University does not regard sending worker students back to production as a matter that will be considered only after their graduation. Rather, it sees to it that during their several years of study the worker students' hands are still stained with grease and their ears are still attuned to the hum of machines. This means that during this period they do not detach themselves from the workers and from production. In the entire course of teaching and study, they persist in repudiating such notions as "one who excels in study will become a government official" and "go to school in order to join the government service." The worker students are taught to set their minds on becoming an ordinary laborer, firmly submit to the needs of the revolution, and consciously and on their initiative go to the most difficult places to work.

For the last seven years workers and cadres in the Shanghai Machine Tool Plant have in practice come to recognize more and more the great significance of Chairman Mao's "July 21 Directive." They indicate proudly: We must go on fighting hard, unswervingly go on taking the "July 21" road pointed out by Chairman Mao, consolidate and develop the achievements of the great cultural revolution, and strive to bring up a mammoth Red and expert army of proletarian intellectuals!

By a Wen-hui Pao correspondent and
a Wen-hui Pao reporter

* * *

It Is Impermissible To Reverse the Verdict Passed on the Revisionist Line in Education

by

Yen Feng (阎沣), Futan University

(Hsüeh-hsi yü P'i-p'an /Study and Criticism/, No. 12, December 14, 1975)

The great proletarian cultural revolution, an unprecedentedly profound political revolution, shattered the domination of the educational sphere by bourgeois intellectuals. This subjected the revisionist line in education pushed by Liu Shao-ch'i and Lin Piao to penetrating criticism and paved the way for the gradual establishment and consolidation of a completely new proletarian education system by means of various types of experiments. Like other fronts throughout the country, thanks to the study and implementation of Chairman Mao's important instructions on the study of theory and concerning combating and preventing revisionism, the situation on the educational front is excellent. The proletarian revolution in education is developing with vigor, the vast numbers of worker-peasant-soldier students are maturing rapidly, and the contingent of intellectuals is undergoing profound changes.

As Lenin pointed out: "After a profound political change, it will always take the people considerable length of time to understand this change." The proletarian revolution in education, as an integral part of the great proletarian cultural revolution, is an extremely penetrating social revolution. Thus the proletarian educational revolution, due to its own course and the reactions it evokes, will go on for a prolonged period and this also will require a prolonged period of debate before people can gain a deep understanding of its meaning. The current big debate that has appeared on the educational front is a reflection of the struggle between the two classes, the two roads and the two lines. Only by unfolding debate as much as possible and truly distinguishing right from wrong in respect of the line can the proletarian educational revolution be carried on in a deep-going way.

An important aspect of the big debate involves the question of how to approach the revisionist educational line. Is it true that the bourgeoisie exercised dictatorship over the proletariat in the educational sphere 17 years before the great cultural revolution? Which after all occupied the dominant position in the educational sphere, Chairman Mao's revolutionary line or the revisionist educational line? Now, someone has come up with this strange talk: "Unless the sun rises from the west, I won't admit that the educational sphere was dominated by a black line 17 years before." This is nothing but a flagrant attempt to reverse the verdict passed on the revisionist line in education.

The revolutionary people will never allow this verdict to be reversed!

The old school before the great cultural revolution was the hereditary domain of the bourgeoisie, the breeding ground of revisionism. For several thousand years this arena was monopolized by the exploiting classes and their children. While the situation improved somewhat after liberation, conditions largely remained unchanged. Under the old educational system, towers after towers were erected higher and higher and this made it impossible for the children of workers and peasants to enter institutions of higher learning. Even those who managed to get in after jumping over the examination hurdle and crossing the line of marks were either expelled not long afterward because they were vilified as "crude porcelain tea cups and bowls that are not suitable for fine carvings," or were absorbed and devoured by the bourgeoisie while climbing that "small treasure tower." "Indigenous in the first year, modern in the second year and disavowing their parents in the third year," they finally renounced their class origin and capitulated to the bourgeoisie. Schools of higher learning at that time fostered students to become revisionist intellectual aristocrats and advocated "studying books of the sages and worthies and turning a deaf ear to things happening in the outside world." As a result of the pursuit of fame and personal gain and dissociation of theory from practice, those who studied philosophy or literature, engineering or science found what they had studied impractical, with students of philosophy understanding little about philosophy, students of literature unable to write novels, students of engineering knowing nothing about the operation or repairing of machinery, and students of science talking big in an ivory tower. Commenting critically on the old education 17 years before the great cultural revolution, Chairman Mao came right to the point when he said: "The old education system is destructive to the fostering of talent and detrimental to youth. I disapprove of it." The appearance of this situation in socialist China in the last analysis is due to the fact that leadership over the school was in the hands of the bourgeoisie.

The great proletarian cultural revolution changed all this. Since its march into the superstructure, the working class has led struggle-criticism-transformation in the school. Worker-peasant-soldier students have gone to universities, run and transform them with Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought. Worker-peasant-soldier instructors have taken the platform. With the introduction of a series of revolutionary measures, such as running schools with an open door, establishing links between the school and the factory and operating school-run factories, the original contingent of teachers in varying degrees has achieved progress after they have taken the road of integrating with the workers and peasants. In addition, many new forms of education have appeared and these include short-term training classes and correspondence courses. The school is being gradually transformed into a tool of proletarian dictatorship.

Every step forward taken by the revolution is bound to be fought desperately. At a time when the revolution in education is developing with vigor, the appearance of the erroneous trend of thought of seeking to reverse the verdict on the revisionist educational line is by no means accidental. It is determined by the law of class struggle. Since

classes, class contradictions and class struggle exist in socialist society, we must take class struggle as the key and use Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought as a weapon to take hold of the essence of the question and in all seriousness criticize this erroneous trend of thought.

Shouldn't we criticize the idea of "excelling in learning to become an official"? Since Confucius preached "erudition qualifies one to be an official" for more than 2,000 years the reactionary rulers have, without exception, looked upon this as the prop for maintaining their reactionary rule. Apart from providing the exploiting classes and their children with the ladder for promotions to higher office and getting rich quick, it served as a heavy spiritual yoke placed around the necks of the laboring people. Since the educational revolution blocks the way for the exploiting classes to get into the superstructure through the school and removes the ladder to officialdom through proficiency in learning, it has naturally aroused their bitter resentment and hostility. Revisionist chieftains such as Liu Shao-ch'i and Lin Piao have all done their best to preach the idea of "excelling in learning to become an official" and to bitterly oppose and negate the revolution in education. Historical experience tells us that as long as the transition from socialist society to communist society is not yet completed, the danger of a capitalist restoration still exists. In view of the possibility of the idea of "excelling in learning to become an official" coming to the fore at any time, our criticism of this idea must not cease for a single day.

Shouldn't we criticize "giving primacy to intellectual education"? Essentially, "intellectual education first" means giving primacy to bourgeois politics. In class society there has never been such a thing as education which is above classes and politics. "One of the manifestations of bourgeois hypocrisy is the belief that the school can be divorced from politics." The revisionist line in education preaches that "education means imparting knowledge" and this is no different from taking over the bourgeois viewpoint on education, which is aimed at fostering bourgeois intellectual aristocrats. The so-called line of marks has always been a lifeline of the exploiting classes and the line of blockade against the children of workers and peasants. Our education must serve proletarian politics. To train and bring up successors to the revolutionary cause of the proletariat, we must bear in mind Chairman Mao's instruction: "Our educational policy should enable one who receives an education to develop morally, intellectually and physically and to become a socialist-minded laborer with culture." We should not permit some people to deliberately try to blur the distinction between attaching importance to intellectual education and "intellectual education first" and reproduce the old stuff of laying stress on intellectual development. It is altogether necessary for the proletariat to grasp intellectual education well since socialist revolution and construction require us to have access to abundant socialist cultural knowledge. However, if we permit the revisionist policy of "giving primacy to intellectual education" to negate the political orientation of the proletariat and forget about the need for the proletariat to exercise all-round dictatorship over the bourgeoisie, then how can we train and foster socialist-minded laborers with culture?

"Read books behind closed doors" -- will this work? Lenin once said: "We would not believe in teaching, training and education if they were confined only to the school and were divorced from the storm of life." "Read books behind closed doors" thus means keeping the students within the bounds of bourgeois education and filling their heads with bourgeois stuff so as to bring up bourgeois successors. We run schools with an open door in order to make education serve proletarian politics and integrate education with productive labor. This calls for a complete overhaul of the old educational system, along with its teaching and learning systems and methods. Those who distort the open-door approach in running schools as "practice--practice--practice" seek to restore "running schools behind closed doors." This amounts to closing the door that has been opened only after several years of the educational revolution, and closing the door to the integration of the vast numbers of revolutionary teachers and students with the workers and peasants means closing the door that leads to the three great revolutionary movements. Doesn't this mean encouraging people to turn back and take the old road? Memories of the bitter lessons we learned 17 years before the great cultural revolution when the revisionist educational line prevailed are still fresh, and we should never forget them.

Since the proletarian educational revolution was unfolded, the debate in the past 17 years has focused on the struggle between the two classes and the two lines. The Lin Piao anti-Party clique openly preached the "considerable merits" of "our education system in these 17 years," during which "the red line predominated." They vainly tried to upset the conclusion reached by Chairman Mao and to openly reverse the verdict passed on Liu Shao-ch'i's revisionist educational line, "using yesterday's mean behavior to defend today's mean act." According to the logic of the Lin Piao anti-Party clique, since for 17 years the "red line" prevailed on the educational front, wouldn't it be all right to take the old road without the need for the educational revolution? Shouldn't we write off all revolutionary actions taken on this front because they are held to be "excessive"? The attempt made by the Lin Piao anti-Party clique to reverse the verdict on Liu Shao-ch'i's revisionist line exactly reflects the will and desire of the defeated classes to recapture their lost hereditary domain. Therefore, we must shout at those comrades who preach erroneous views: "Comrades, where are you going?"

To affirm or negate the educational revolution? This in essence is a question of affirming or negating the great cultural revolution. Is the great proletarian cultural revolution a fine success or a terrible mess? Is the great proletarian cultural revolution absolutely necessary and most timely? These questions have to be debated and made clear. The current debate on the educational front is no isolated incident, and should have the concern of each and every revolutionary comrade. Only by distinguishing right from wrong in the ideological and political line is it possible to consolidate and develop the achievements of the great proletarian cultural revolution, so that we will be able to advance triumphantly along Chairman Mao's revolutionary line in our great cause of socialist revolution and socialist construction.

* * *

and the poetic garden was deadly silent, he could not help crying out aloud: "Where in China are those fighters of the spiritual word?" Eagerly he hoped to wake the Chinese people to break through the net of the old society with poems filled with militant enthusiasm.

The path of revolution cannot be straight, and the new poetry must likewise follow a zigzag path. When Hu Shih and his associates were clamoring for "the great emancipation of the style of poetry," Lu Hsün in his article "Enemy of Poetry and Songs" written in 1925 pointed out: "To this day I still do not know whether it is true to say that literature has taken a turn for the better after its revolution. But stage plays haven't begun to sprout, while poems and songs are dying. Even if there were a few people who groan occasionally, they would be like winter flowers trembling in the cold wind." In 1934, he said again: "Up to now, the new poetry is still under the spell of bad fortune." Since the new poetry was still in its budding stage, how come it was "under the spell of bad fortune" and "dying"? Here there are thought-provoking historical lessons.

The emergence of the new poetry in the "May 4" period had a positive effect on breaking the ideological fetters of the old poetry. Some revolutionary democratic poets who were influenced by socialism used new poetry as a weapon in the fight against imperialism and feudalism. But at that time, many "lack the critical spirit of historical materialism. To them, what is bad is absolutely bad, and what is good is absolutely good." In opposing feudal old culture, they failed to inherit critically and analytically the fine traditions of the Chinese classical poems and songs, and in absorbing foreign things, they failed to pay any attention to eliminating their dross as well as factors that did not suit our country's concrete conditions. From the very beginning of the new cultural movement the bourgeois right-wing represented by Hu Shih were opposed to the anti-imperialist and anti-feudalist spirit of "May 4." They were a bunch of lackeys kneeling before Western culture. Hu Shih once professed himself to be the leader of "the revolution in the realm of poetry." In fact, what he put forward was no more than a formalistic program of complete Europeanization. He said: "A history of Chinese literature is only a history of metabolism in the form of written language (used as a tool)." "A poem is written when there is a topic to write about; poems should be written the way they ought to be written." As to content and form, one need not care about them, and one may even forget one's ancestors and national traditions. Mincing no words, Hu Shih said: "My practical experiments with vernacular poems are only an application of my experimentalism." Then precisely what kind of "practical experiments" were his "vernacular poems"? Let's look at his famous work "My Son," which he wrote more than two months after the May 4 Movement:

I really didn't want a son,
He just came by himself.
Now it is impossible to hang up
The signboard "there is no son to succeed me"!

What is "vernacular" is no better than nonsense. The intent of such an "experiment" by Hu Shih was later explained by his partner Liang Shih-ch'iu of the New Moon School: "Foreign-style poems written in Chinese and filled with foreign poetic meaning."

Marx said: "What is old always tries its best to revive and consolidate itself in new form." Hu Shih's Collection of Experiments represented "experiments" made by the reactionary big landlord class and comprador bourgeoisie to restore what was old in the new form of "vernacular poetry." Anything "new" in content was designed to meet the needs of imperialist aggression and to merge the feudal old culture with the so-called imperialist new culture in order to oppose the proletarian new culture.

To safeguard the healthy growth of the new poetry, Lu Hsün waged a firm struggle against Hu Shih and associates who were ruining it. He said: "Although there are two kinds of poems and songs -- one for reading and the other for singing, the latter kind is ultimately better. It is a pity that China's new poetry probably belongs to the former category. Because it has no rhythm and no rhyme, it can't be sung. When it can't be sung, it can't be remembered; when it can't be remembered, it can't squeeze out the old poetry in people's minds and take its place." He also pointed out: "I think that content apart, the new poetry must first have rhythm and rhyme, so it can be easily remembered, read and sung. But it isn't easy at all to make spoken words rhyme naturally. I myself really can't do it. I can only comment."

Lu Hsün's comments are very profound. In seriously dwelling on the form of the new poetry, he wanted to draw a clear line of demarcation with the old ideology and old culture. Form depends on content, and at the same time reacts on it. Lenin said: "A form is accompanied by content which is vivid and actual; it is a form that is inseparable from content." This is true of the relation between form and content in poetry. One who proceeds from formalism cannot solve the problem of form of the new poetry. The causes of defects in form must be sought from content. At that time, principal readers of the new poetry were confined to the small circles of intellectuals, and the authors of the new poetry were also basically a group of intellectuals who were cultivated in bourgeois culture and divorced from the masses. Their works did not express the thoughts and sentiments of the revolutionary masses in content, nor did they conform to the appreciation habits of the Chinese folks in form. In order to occupy the ideological and cultural fronts with progressive and revolutionary poems and songs, it was necessary to see to it that poems and songs were written in such a way that they were easy to remember, understand, and sing and were moving and popular among the broad masses.

Lu Hsün's demands on the new poetry should and can entirely be met. Traditionally, Chinese classical poems and songs are linked with music. Poems and songs have all along been inseparable. Discussing the origin of culture in "A Layman's Talk on Writing," Lu Hsün described members of the "Yo, heave ho!" School as the earliest writers. "Yo, heave

ho!" is a rhythm in both poetry and music. Judging by the history of literature, whether they were poems consisting of four characters or five characters or seven characters to a line, whether they were T'ang, Sung or Yüan poems, and whether they were popular ancient court songs or bamboo ballads or folksongs, basically they were either set to score or could be sung aloud. Melodic words that can be read fluently are easy to spread. Lu Hsün's demands on the new poetry fully conform to the traditions and laws of development of Chinese poetry and songs. What is more, Lu Hsün stated that "the form need not be too strict" and "old poetic rhymes need not be followed." This explained not only the dialectical relationship between form and content, but also the dialectical relationship between inheritance and creation, thereby opening up a correct path of development for the new poetry.

Indeed it was not easy for the new poetry to meet these demands. From the 1920's to the 1930's, quite a few people wanted to create a new kind of verse form. Although they racked their brains in their study, what they produced was like dry paper flowers devoid of life. In view of this wrong tendency in the development of poetry and songs, Lu Hsün particularly emphasized the importance of learning from folksongs, pointing out that when the old literature was on the decline "a new direction" in poetry and songs could often be brought about by absorbing the "new nutrient" from folksongs. But folksongs should also be analyzed. While there were revolutionary and healthy folksongs, many were backward and obscene. Thus, there was a question of how to learn from folksongs, as one should not stress the imitation of form alone. Lu Hsün said: "I think songs, poems, verses and ballads originally belonged to the people. Taking them over, the men of letters made them increasingly hard to understand and turned into petrified rocks. Then they would take some more and slowly strangle them to death." After "May 4," some in the cultural circles also trumpeted folksongs for a while and even set up a group to study them. But basically, they approached them from the angle of form, took the attitude of hunting rare animals, and even chased after the backward things in them. So, when the "body of folksongs" fell to their hands, it was no longer "strong and fresh" but became totally listless until it was an empty shell. When Lu Hsün criticized those authors of vernacular poems for "studding compositions with 'selections'" and "turning them into something of a rectangular block," he was aiming at the wrong tendency of divorcing from the masses and fabricating new style and rhythm behind closed doors.

Lu Hsün attached great importance to poetry form, but he was firmly opposed to formalism and aestheticism. He always put the class nature and militancy of poetry and songs in the first place. At that time, the New Moon School advocated that "a poet must make poems just as a plant must bloom." So, Lu Hsün pointed out: Although this metaphor is beautiful, it is very erroneous. "Erroneous because a poet is after all not a plant, but is a human being in society." Puncturing such "above-class" double talks, Lu Hsün, with a clearcut class viewpoint, warmly praised the revolutionary martyr Yin Fu's collection of poems "Belong To Another World," and he strongly refuted the theory that

serenity and aloofness should be the poetry's ultimate. Proletarian poems and songs are not idyllic songs, but are emotion-charged battle songs inspiring the people to march forward. The proletarian poets are not men of letters who moan and groan without sickness, but are dauntless fighters charging at the front of struggle.

Lu Hsün attached importance to the unity of politics and art and the unity of content and form. He opposed the metaphysical concept in the creation of poems and songs. When there was a tendency among certain authors of poems and songs in the revolutionary camp to fill their works with "catchwords and slogans," Lu Hsün pointed out: "Slogans are slogans, and poems are poems. If slogans are used and the poems are still good, it is all right to use them. If poems are bad, it does't matter whether you use them or not." The main cause of such a tendency at that time lay in the fact that the writers were not familiar with the militant life of the masses and lacked dialectics in their minds. Chairman Mao points out: "Therefore, we oppose both works of art with a wrong political viewpoint and the tendency toward the 'poster and slogan style' which is correct in political viewpoint but lacking in artistic power. On questions of literature and art we must carry on a struggle on two fronts." In the struggle on two lines, Lu Hsün strongly stressed that the creation of poetry and songs must serve proletarian politics, and made an incisive exposition on the unity of content and form. He set us a brilliant example.

Although Lu Hsün's thesis on poetry was written several decades ago, it still provokes our thought today. We are now in a great era, and under the guidance of Chairman Mao's revolutionary line on literature and art, we should strive to produce more militant poems worthy of the great era!

* * *

Learn To Look at a Problem All-sidedly

by

Fang Hai (方 海)

(Hsüeh-hsi yü P'i-p'an /Study and Criticism/, No. 11, November 14, 1975)

In "Speech at the Chinese Communist Party's National Conference on Propaganda Work," Chairman Mao teaches us to "overcome one-sidedness step by step" and "employ the method of looking at a problem all-sidedly."

Looking at problems all-sidedly means analyzing the contradictions in things with the dialectical viewpoint. The fundamental viewpoint of dialectics is one divides into two, maintaining that the unity of things consists of two aspects that are mutually excluding and mutually complementing. The things we come across in our daily life and work are made up of two opposite aspects. The proletariat and the bourgeoisie, politics and vocational work, unity and struggle, the advanced and the backward, achievements and shortcomings, materialism and idealism,and dialectics and metaphysics are mutually existing and mutually contradicting entities. For this reason, we should look at problems from all sides, not just one. We should look at the positive as well as the negative aspects of things, not overlooking their past, present and future. In actual work, our cadres in their reports invariably mention the good and bad points and the number of points scored in each case. In summing up work, they always affirm achievements without overlooking shortcomings, summarizing both successful experiences and drawing lessons from failures. This is the correct attitude we should take in approaching things and analyzing them with dialectics. Otherwise, we are liable to make mistakes of one-sidedness.

Whether we look at problems all-sidedly or one-sidedly reflects the fundamental antagonism between dialectics and metaphysics. The metaphysicists look at problems in isolation and one-sidedly, instead of getting into the essence of things from all aspects of things and the connections between them. They often know only one side without knowing the other side, understanding this side without understanding that side and comprehending the appearance without getting into the essence. Using this method to understand things, one will only see the achievements in work but not its defects, or see only the shortcomings but not the achievements. When these people talk about unity, they discuss only unity but not struggle, or mention only struggle but not unity. To use this method to guide work is to put work in a passive state and even cause it to fail. One-sided metaphysics does great harm to revolution and construction. Therefore, Chairman Mao has always taught us to give importance to the study and propagation of materialist dialectics and to combating and criticizing metaphysics. Chairman Mao points out: "People always observe and deal with problems and give their views on the basis of their own experience, and sometimes it is inevitable that they tend to become one-sided. But, is it possible to ask people to overcome one-sidedness step by step and look at problems more all-sidedly? I think

this should be called for." All comrades who truly desire to do a good job of both revolution and construction should follow Chairman Mao's teachings and overcome one-sidedness step by step and improve their ability to observe and handle problems all-sidedly.

To combat metaphysical one-sidedness, it is essential that struggle between opposites be unfolded. What is one-sided is often confined to personal experience, with emphasis on the angle of one's own viewpoint. This way of looking at things may sometimes embrace part of the correct elements. Hence, those who have made one-sided mistakes often are not aware of their errors. As a matter of fact, isn't it one-sidedness to mistake some correctness for all correctness? Chairman Mao points out: "With comparison there is distinction. With distinction there is struggle and then there is development." To overcome one-sidedness, one should learn to compare, learn to stage a "rival drama" and learn to unfold debate or struggle between opposites. This is because to get into the essence of a thing, it is not enough to investigate the thing itself and it is essential that comparison be made between it and the other things to which it is related. Only through debate and comparison can the various aspects of the contradiction be fully revealed. Only then can people distinguish what is correct from what is wrong, thus transforming one-sided views into more all-round views and using correct judgments to overcome incorrect ones. A popular saying goes, "What really matters is not whether you know the goods but whether there is other goods to compare with it." Herein lies the truth.

Making comparison and holding debate is a good way to learn step by step to look at problems all-sidedly, a practice that has all along been advocated by our Party. In leading the protracted struggle in the Chinese revolution, Chairman Mao often resorted to debate and comparison in the fight against metaphysical ideas. The victory of the War of Resistance Against Japan was won through repeated debates. Was resistance against Japan necessary? One group of people disregarded the human factor, relied solely on weapons, and advocated surrender to Japanese imperialism on the ground that China lacked arms. Another group was unafraid and attached importance to the human factor, declaring that as long as the multitudes were aroused and depended upon, the war could be fought and Japanese imperialism defeated even with inferior arms. Here, we have the question of how to approach the material and human factors. It is metaphysical to see matter and not man. If this viewpoint develops it will inevitably lead to political capitulationism. In the socialist period, likewise, it is continuous debate on the questions arising from socialist revolution and construction that has enabled our comrades to gain relatively all-sided understanding and experience, making it possible for the revolutionary Marxist line to continuously defeat the erroneous revisionist line. In the 1957 rectification campaign and anti-Rightist struggle, for instance, a host of vital issues were put to debate. Were socialist revolution and construction good or bad? Was there any achievement? Were achievements or mistakes primary? Should we keep to the socialist road or take the capitalist road? Which party should lead the cause of socialism? Through such extensive debates the cardinal issue of right and wrong regarding the line was made clear and this proved that the views of the bourgeois

Rightists were wrong and did not conform with the actual situation. During the great proletarian cultural revolution this method of holding debate and making comparison was by and large applied and mastered. If we want to combat one-sidedness and learn to look at problems all-sidedly today, it is still necessary to continue adopting this method.

To make a success of looking at problems all-sidedly, we must analyze the two aspects of things. But Marxism holds that the two aspects of things should never be treated in equal measure and without distinction. Chairman Mao points out: "The nature of a thing is determined mainly by the principal aspect of the contradiction which gains the dominant position." Of the two aspects of a thing, one is always principal and the other secondary. In the relationship between politics and vocational work, for instance, politics is primary, and it is necessary to oppose the tendency to show no interest in politics. However, understanding neither skill nor vocational work also will not do. Therefore, the proletariat has always insisted on politics in command of vocational work. In approaching our tasks, we should also make clear whether the good and correct aspects or the bad, erroneous and defective aspects are the principal aspects. To look at a problem from the essence and mainstream means to look at it from its main aspect. To stress the non-essential and secondary aspects of problems instead of looking at the essential and main aspects means one type of one-sidedness. Naturally, we should not overlook the non-essential and secondary aspects of problems and these must be resolved one by one. However, we should not regard these as the essential and main aspects at the risk of losing our bearings. Opportunism is characterized by its passing off dualism as the Marxist two-point theory, using the theory of egalitarianism to castrate the theory of priority. They place the two aspects of a thing in parallel positions, without distinguishing the first from the second, the principal from the secondary, the mainstream from the tributary, even describing secondary and non-essential things as primary and essential things. As a result, the truth of things is covered up and the essence of things blurred. This often leads people down the wrong path.

In learning to look at problems all-sidedly, we must also oppose the static viewpoint and uphold the viewpoint of development. All things are in motion and in given conditions the two contradictory aspects of a thing will also transform themselves. While good and bad things are mutually excluding, good things embrace bad elements and bad things contain good elements. "In given conditions, a bad thing can lead to good results and a good thing to bad results." For instance, old China left us poverty and blankness, and to build socialism on such a basis is a disadvantage. However, when one is poor, one wants change, action and revolution. This disadvantage can arouse the broad masses to display the revolutionary spirit of hard struggle and achieving rejuvenation through self-reliance. Then the disadvantage transforms itself into an advantage and a bad thing into a good thing. Throughout the country today, a large number of advanced units which have distinguished themselves in learning from Tach'ing in industry and Tachai in agriculture have appeared. They are all guided by Chairman Mao's revolutionary line and rely on the

revolutionary vigor and scientific attitude of the broad masses to create wonders in this world. If we practice metaphysics and regard past backwardness as perpetual, then we will lose our national self-confidence, have blind faith in the bourgeoisie of foreign countries, doubt and dare not firmly uphold the principle of maintaining independence and keeping the initiative in our hands and relying on our own efforts, and very likely degenerate into despicable capitulationists. For another instance, we should also apply the viewpoint of development in viewing new things emerging from the revolutionary mass movements. No new thing is perfect the moment it appears, because it has to follow a course of continuous development before it attains perfection. But, despite their shortcomings and problems in the course of their development, new things represent the direction of advance for the revolution. We should therefore actively support them and must not reject them outright because they have defects and problems, or use these as a pretext for turning back to the old road.

In combating one-sidedness, we should also guard against one tendency covering up another. When we concentrate on criticism of a certain erroneous tendency at a certain stage, very often the situation of "excessive correction" appears. This is unavoidable and sometimes even necessary. However, if we fail to view this in the dialectical way, then another erroneous tendency will very likely appear. Because of this, we should adopt a correct analytical attitude toward the achievements and problems in the work we have done. We should affirm as much as possible those main and essential things found in past work and refrain from negating all that was undertaken like throwing the baby away with the bath water because of criticism of a certain tendency. In the educational revolution, for example, we have smashed past revisionist practices and started to run schools with an open door, closely integrating classroom instruction with the three major revolutionary movements. This is in correspondence with Chairman Mao's revolutionary line. However, in the course of practice, we also must pay attention to preventing the tendency to open the door of the school but not conduct teaching or even negate classroom instruction. In guiding against such tendencies gingerly, we must firmly uphold and fully implement the Party's educational policy. If we one-sidedly emphasize classroom instruction, close the door that has been opened and even negate the basic principle of linking theory with practice, then we will be totally wrong. In dealing with new contradictions and new problems that keep cropping up in the revolutionary course, we must pay attention to distinguishing those caused by the "Left" and Right interferences of the erroneous line from those caused by our mistakes on account of inexperience and those that are quite normal in the course of the development of things. We should understand this as part of the whole course in its entirety. Only by analyzing the causes of change in things in relation to their connections (not in isolation), development (not in stagnation), and all-sidedly (not one-sidedly) can we get hold of the various aspects of contradictions and avoid wavering to the left and right.

Whether one looks at a problem all-sidedly or one-sidedly, in the final analysis, is determined by his world outlook. The world outlook and methodology are consistent with each other. To master scientific

methodology we must have the correct world outlook. To combat one-sidedness and learn to look at problems all-sidedly, we must--in conjunction with the realities of the three major revolutionary movements--conscientiously study the works by Marx, Engels, Lenin and Chairman Mao, transform our own world outlook and discerning power. The one-sidedness in one's ways of thinking has its deep roots in the theory of knowledge and class and social causes. When dwelling upon the epistemological source of idealism, Lenin pointed out that knowledge advances in spiral and any segment along this curve may be turned into an independent and complete straight line and lead people down the quagmire. When classes and class struggle still exist in class society and when the influence of old ideas continues to prevail, people's knowledge of things all the more is stamped with the brand of class. Therefore, propagating materialist dialectics, criticizing metaphysics and overcoming one-sidedness is our regular fighting task on the ideological front. Only by studying seriously, going deep among the masses, conducting investigation and study and summing up experience in struggle, by closely integrating theory with practice and closely linking the transformation of the objective world with that of the subjective world can we sort out our thinking, enhance our ability to do things according to the dialectical-materialist theory of knowledge, and truly carry out all work well.

* * *

The Yaksa War Was China's Just War of Resistance Against Tsarist Russian Aggression

- Refuting fallacies of Soviet revisionists in distorting the nature of the Yaksa war

by

Ch'ün Che (群哲)

(Li-shih Yen-chiu /Historical Research/, No. 4, August 20, 1975)

The Yaksa (Albazin) War that raged in the upstream regions of the Heilung River in the 1680's was a just war conducted by China to expel the Tsarist Russian aggressors and recover its sacred territory occupied by them. The war was forced upon China by Tsarist Russia. Beginning with the early 1640's, Tsarist Russia despatched small armed bands into China's Heilung River valley, violating China's sovereignty, robbing the Chinese people of their property, and taking their lives. The many protests and representations lodged by the Chinese government were ignored by Tsarist Russia. The Chinese army and people were thus forced to rise in self-defense and resist the Tsarist Russian aggression. That the Yaksa War was a just war waged by the Chinese army and people to repel Tsarist Russian aggression is a clear historical fact on which conclusions have long been drawn. In recent years, however, proceeding from their political needs to oppose China and promote expansionism, the Soviet revisionist renegade clique has done its utmost to act as apologists for the old Tsars, whose hands were stained with the blood of the Chinese people, and to prepare public opinion in favor of furthering aggression against China. They instructed their court scholars to produce a great number of "special treatises" distorting, tampering with and forging Chinese history. These so-called "special treatises" turn facts upside down and black into white, wilfully alter the early history of Sino-Russian relations and distort the nature of the Yaksa War. The Soviet revisionist official, Kapitsai (费孟才), nonsensically alleges in an article that the Yaksa War was "intrusion into Russian territory" with the "aim of expelling Russians from regions they had opened up since ancient times."* Such so-called "special treatises" as China's Modern History and The Manchus in the Northeast in the 17th Century cast forth by such Soviet revisionist court scholars as Trikhvinskiy and Mailihov (麦利霍夫) are also attempts to substantiate these absurdities. On the surface, they seem to bring in bundles of circumstantial evidence, but actually they resort to exceedingly foul means such as quoting out of context, random distortions and tampering with history.

---

* Kapitsai, "Documents That Confirm the Truth," Izvestia, November 13, 1972.

I. The Yaksa War Was Caused By Tsarist Russia's Invasion of Chinese Territory

The Soviet revisionist court sholars say: The region along the banks of the Heilung River -- including the Yaksa area -- was "developed" by Russia's "new land discoverers" and was "officially drawn into the Russian map in the 1680's." They take pains to omit no details in listing the names of "all the fortresses built along the banks of the Amur River (writer's note: the Heilung River) prior to the 1680's." They say: "Before the Manchu army attacked these places," "there were already more than 20 settlements in the area" lying "between the Shilka River and the Kumala River (writer's note: the Huma River)."* Accordingly, they concluded: the China-initiated "military action along the banks of the Amur River from 1683 to 1686 should be assessed as a predatory war and an act of aggression,"** representing China's "armed attempt to extend its jurisdiction into territory already inhabited and developed by Russians."*** In sum, what they have said amounts to nothing more than saying: The Yaksa War launched by China was conducted on "Russian territory," and therefore it was "aggression" and "expansion." But this is an out-and-out lie.

The Heilung River region has always been China's sacred territory since ancient times, a fact that has long been clearly recorded in history books and well known to the whole world. Let's not go too far back. In the first half of the 8th century, the T'ang Dynasty set up here the Shihwei and Heishui government offices. In the 10th century, the Liao Dynasty exercised direct control over this area. In the 12th century, the Chin Dynasty set up separately the P'uyü Lu /administrative organ/ and the Huli Lu in the upper and lower reaches of the Heilung River. The Yaksa district was governed by P'uyü Lu. In the 13th century, the Yüan Dynasty set up in these areas the K'aiyüan Lu and Shuitata Lu.

By the Ming Dynasty, the administration of the Heilung River region was further streamlined. The well-known Nurkan Command that administered a vast region encompassing the Heilung River valley was established in 1409 (7th year of Yunglo of Ming). Under it were set up more than 400 garrison and administrative offices, forming a vast administrative network. The Yaksa district was put under the control of the Pulutanho commandery in March 1407 (5th year of Yunglo). Factual Records of Ming recorded such events as the paying of tribute by the people of various nationalities inhabiting these areas to the Ming Dynasty. For example, in 1407, five days before the inauguration of the Pulutanho commandery, the Nuchens in that area arrived

---

* Mailihov, The Manchus in the Northeast in the 17th Century, 1974 Russian edition.

** Ibid.

*** Trikhvinskiy, China's Modern History, p. 57.

to pay tribute to the Ming court.* In June 1513, "Nuchih commanding officers of the Haihsi and Pulutanho and other commanderies arrived at the court to present horses as tribute. They were feted and rewarded with robes embroidered in gold and a variety of silk piece goods."** All this proves that long before Russia located in Europe formed a unified nation, China had begun to exercise jurisdiction over the Heilung River region and did so effectively.

However, the scholars in the pay of the Soviet revisionists are silent about these historical facts. Instead they want to deceive the world by such means as cutting the threads of history. They nonsensically allege: "The varying nature of documents provided by Factual Records, annals compiled by the Manchu Ch'ing, and other official Ch'ing documents prove that the territory encompassed in what is known as Heilungkiang today did not belong to the Manchus before the early 1680's, nor had it been drawn into the administrative boundaries of the Ch'ing Empire as extra-frontier territory."+ Such a foul means of breaking up the historical sequence is unworthy of being refuted, because any person with a little common knowledge knows that China's history did not begin with the Ch'ing Dynasty, which represented only a phase of Chinese history of several thousand years. Moreover, even in Ch'ing, these areas were entirely Chinese territory, and historical facts are by no means like those fabricated by the scholars of Soviet revisionism.

Before moving into Shanhaikuan, the Ch'ing rulers had already unified the various tribes in the Northeast, and by 1642 (15th year of Ming Ch'ung Chen, or 7th year of Ch'ing Ch'ung Te) had completely taken over all the garrison and administrative offices formerly under the Ming Nurkan Command, and the Heilung River valley was also put under Ch'ing control. In a letter to the Ming Emperor Ch'ung Chen, Huangt'aichi, in his capacity as Ch'ing T'ai Tsung, made it very clear: "Since I inherited the throne from my ancestors, with God's blessing, I have brought under my control all people located between the northeast sea coast (the Okhotsk Sea and the Sea of Japan--writer) and the northwest sea coast (Lake Baikal, known formerly as Peihai or Paihai--writer), the tribes of Shihchuan and Shihlu, the people and land of the silver fox and the black sable where settlers such as the Olute live on fishing and hunting and do not plow the earth, and whose boundaries extend to the source of the Kannan River, as well as states beyond."++ After the Ch'ing rulers acquired nationwide power, they established the Ninguta Command to administer the areas along the Heilung

---

* Factual Records of Ming T'ai Tsung, Vol. 48, 3rd month of 5th year of Yunglo.

** Factual Records of Ming Wu Tsung, Vol. 132, 5th month of 8th year of Chengte.

\+ Mailihov, op cit.

++ Factual Records of Ch'ing T'ai Tsung, Vol. 61.

River. As to the various nationalities such as the Solun and the Tahur that settled in areas in the upper and middle reaches of the Heilung River including Yaksa, they were all successively "incorporated into the eight banners and designated Niulu"* during the reign of Ch'ung Te (around 1640). Put under the jurisdiction of the Ninguta Command, it was administered by the superintendents of Put'eha.**

A large number of documents in Chinese history indicate that such nationalities as the Solun and Tahur in the Heilung River region had intimate political connections with the Ch'ing government. One of the more outstanding examples was Bardach (巴尔达齐), a leader of the Tahur nationality. Bardach had never stopped paying tribute to the Ch'ing court for the more than 20 years from the 8th year of T'ientsung (1634) to the 12th year of Shunchih (1655). The Ch'ing government conferred upon him the title of Lord of the 1st Order (A-ssu-ha-ni-ha-fan) and gave him the hand of a daughter of the royal house. Bardach and other leaders of the Tahur and Solun such as Albasi (阿尔巴西) lived along the middle and upper reaches of the Heilung River for generations and all along remained Chinese subjects. As government officials, they administered the people and land in this region.

Yet the court scholars of the Soviet revisionists, blind to a great number of facts, openly tell lies, saying nonsensically that the areas along the Heilung River had been opened up by them since ancient times. In reality, when the Chinese government was effectively administering the region and the Chinese people had attained remarkable achievements in the development of the area, the Russians not only did not reach the banks of the Heilung River, but they even did not know that such a huge river existed. Russia's historical documents confirm that it was in 1636 that Russians first heard about the Heilung River.*** The expansiveness and rich natural resources of the Heilung River region whetted the appetite of the aggressive Tsarist Russian Government. In 1643-1644, it sent a small band of armed bandits led by Poyarkov (波雅科夫), a civil officer from Yakutsk, to intrude for the first time into the middle and lower streams of the Heilung River. This first batch of invaders committed crimes wherever they went, but were not able to stay long in face of the resistance and attack by the people of various nationalities in China. However, these gangsters saw that along the

---

* Reference Material on the Northern Territories, Vol. 2; "Memoranda on Solun and Other Tribes."

** See Reference Material on the Northern Territories, Vol. 2: "Put'eha first had two superintendents and eight deputies for Solun and Tahur.....Put'eha represented all pastoral tribes and was in charge of all the mountains and plains as well as the pickers and hunters living on it within the thousands of miles of the Northeast."

*** Gansovich (冈察维奇), History of the Amur Border Region, appendix "Chronology of Important Events Along the Amur," 1915 Russian edition.

banks of the Heilung and Chingch'ili rivers, "the Tahur villages were connected,.... and fields where wheat, barley, oats, millet, hemp and peas grew stretched over large tracts of land. The Tahurs in this area raised lots of domestic animals and poultry -- horses, cattle, sheep, especially pigs and chickens." Apart from an abundance of rich, "Bardach's land grew vegetables, cucumbers, poppy, soybeans, garlic, apples, pears, walnuts and strobiles."* The indisputable fact is that before the Tsarist Russian aggressors set foot in the region along the banks of the Heilung River, it had already long been developed by the people of various nationalities in China, with remarkable progress in agriculture and animal husbandry.

In 1650, the Tsarist Russian Government despatched another band of armed bandits led by Khabarov to make another intrusion into the middle and upper stream regions of the Heilung River through a different route. It was these blood-thirsty gangsters who for the first time invaded and occupied the Chinese city of Yaksa. Yaksa was situated on the left bank of the Heilung River, "an important junction of both water and land communications."** Yaksa in the Nuchen dialect meant "a washed away river bend."+ At the time of Khabarov's intrusion, Yaksa was the home of the Chinese Tahur leader Albasi. On the right bank of the Heilung River was a small river within Chinese territory. It was called Albasi (now known as Omur River). Yaksa was located across the mouth of that river.++ According to Russian historical records, when Khabarov infiltrated into the Heilung River region in 1651, "he was attracted to the position and defense facilities of this city,.... so, he decided to stay there, strengthen its fortifications and make it his own base of operations on the Amur River. The city was named after the Tahur chieftain Albasi and known as Albazin."+++

---

* Quoted from Kamaning (卡马宁), Earliest Explorers in the Far East, 1951 Russian edition.

** Reference Material on the Northern Territories, Vol. 14, "Study of Yaksa City."

\+ An Examination of Ch'ing Documents, Vol. 5, Geography.

++ See maps published by China such as "Map of Heilungkiang." Refer also to the draft map drawn by the Tsarist Russian Cossack Beidun (别依顿) in the 17th century and "Map of Amur River Valley" drawn by Lemaizhov (列麦佐夫) in the early 18th century and appended to Russian-Chinese Relations in the 17th Century. See also Gansovich, History of the Amur Border Region.

+++ Glubozhov (格鲁勃佐夫), History of the Ancient City of Albazin, 1902 Russian edition.

While holding on to Yaksa, Khabarov and his men went out everywhere to carry out plunder, trampling the Chinese inhabitants underfoot. This not only aroused the extreme indignation of the people of various nationalities in China, but it also drew the attention of the Chinese government. Attacked by the Chinese army and people, this band of Tsarist Russian gangsters that invaded areas along the Heilung River was largely eliminated. But soon afterward, in 1665, another gang of desperados led by Chernigovskiy (切尔尼戈夫斯基) infiltrated the upper reaches of the Heilung River, and "holding Yaksa as their lair," plundered and did many evils in areas around it. Their tentacles of aggression even extended as far as into the heartland of China's Northeast. The Chinese people of various nationalities who hunted in their own territory around Yaksa were often brutally murdered. A statement found in Russian official documents reads: "This year, 1682, five or six days before the final day of the Philupu (菲律普) vegetarian period, namely, the day commemorating Mikhayil (米哈依尔), Cossacks at Albazin lured 20 Chinese hunters from the monastery settlement in the upper reaches to their winter camp, and then set fire to it. As to the horses, food and articles of the Chinese hunters, these were all seized by the Cossacks at Albazin."* This event was also recorded in Chinese documents. An imperial edict of the 9th month of the 22nd year of K'ang Hsi (1683) made the following reference: "The Russians refused to come to their senses,.... again they lured 20 mink hunters of the Solun, Tahur and Olunchun tribes into their camp and burned them all to death."**

Such violence on the part of the Tsarist Russian aggressors disrupted the peaceful life of the people of various nationalities of China inhabiting areas along the Heilung River and undermined the development of the agricultural and pastoral economy there. In the several decades of Tsarist Russian incursion, the rich and fertile areas along the Heilung River were badly ravaged by the Cossacks. The 1935 edition of the Soviet Grand Encyclopedia pointed out: Following the Tsarist Russian Cossacks' "invasion of the peaceful Tahur region, the people and the land there suffered considerably. Towns were reduced to ruins, farmland was laid waste, and the inhabitants .... were forced to abandon their homes."*** Such was the true picture of the areas along the Heilung River which were described by the court scholars of the Soviet revisionists as being "developed" and "opened" by Tsarist Russia for "well over 40 years"!

Where there is aggression there is resistance. The evil deeds perpetrated by the Tsarist Russian aggressors on Chinese soil could not of course be ignored by the Chinese government and people of various nationalities.

---

* Supplementary Edition of Historical Documents, Vol. 10, pp. 230-233, Russian edition.

** Factual Records of Ch'ing Sheng Tsu, Vol. 112, pp. 4-6.

*** Soviet Grand Encyclopedia, Vol. 59, pp. 373-374, 1935 Russian edition.

The invasion of Chinese territory by Tsarist Russia and its killing of the Chinese people were behind the cause of the Yaksa War.

II. The Yaksa War Was Forced on China

In order to make the Yaksa War appear as China's war of aggression against Russia, the court scholars of Soviet revisionism do their best to distort all peaceful efforts made by China before the war, and make no mention about China's many protests and representations. But facts are better than rhetoric, and lies cannot change history.

The earliest instance of incursion into the Heilung River valley by Tsarist Russian Cossacks took place when the Ch'ing Dynasty had just been established in China and before the unification of the whole country was completed. As civil wars were frequent, the Ch'ing Dynasty had to devote its main energies to handling its domestic affairs. Therefore, the Ch'ing government sought to settle the issue of Russian aggression peacefully through diplomatic channels. In 1655, when the first Tsarist Russian diplomatic mission arrived in China, the Ch'ing government justly put before the Tsarist Russian envoy Baikov (贝科夫) the stern and forceful question: Why did "Russian Cossacks harass the Heilung River and kill Chinese subjects?" Baikov, disclaiming responsibility, stated that the Cossacks harassing the Heilung River region were "bandits" and that "their actions did not have the sanction of the Russian monarch." Later, several Tsarist Russian emissaries who arrived in China, such as Apolin (阿勃林), also issued similar statements.* Under such circumstances, in order to maintain its sacred sovereignty and protect the lives of the people of various nationalities, the Chinese side could not but counter the invading and evil-doing Cossacks with force. So, several battles ensued; these included the battle at the mouth of the Humar River (1655), the battle at Shang-chien-wu-hei (1657), the battle around the Sungari River (1658), the battle of Kufat'an Village (1660) and the battle of Heilasumi (1664). This deflated the arrogance of the Tsarist Russian aggressors for some time and basically wiped out the Tsarist Russian intruders along the banks of the Heilung River and its various tributaries.

However, the Tsarist Russian Government did not give up its aggressive ambitions because of setbacks suffered during its armed attempt. Apart from continuing to seek every opportunity to invade and occupy Chinese territory, "building fortifications" and "killing Chinese inhabitants" (in 1665 a band of Tsarist Russian desperados led by Chernigovskiy intruded into and occupied the Chinese territory of Yaksa), it also conducted subversive activities in China's border regions, driving a wedge between various nationalities along the Chinese border and inciting war between the Olute and the Khalkha, in an attempt to weaken China's frontier defenses,

---

* Bandesh-Kaminskiy: Collections of Diplomatic Documents Between Russia and China, 1619-1792, p. 17, 1882 Russian edition.

create quarrels among the various nationalities and await the opportunity to fish in troubled waters and dominate these areas.

In 1667, a military commander of China's Solun nationality, by the name of Kentemur (根特木尔), defected to Russia in betrayal of his country. The Ch'ing Government ordered a Charkuchi (扎尔固齐) to lead an army to Nipuchu to have Kentemur extradited and demand that the invaders entrenched at such places as Yaksa and Nipuchu and harassing the Heilung River region identify themselves. Pressed by the Chinese side, the Tsarist Russian Army Commander D. Arshinskiy (达·阿尔申斯基) admitted that they were no "bandits" but "subjects of the great monarch, the white Tsar," and that they were building fortifications in these areas "also under orders."* From here it can be seen that the Cossacks' intrusion was carried out on the Tsar's orders. At that time, although Charkuchi had an army, he did not resort to force but made a formal request to the Russians for the return of the Chinese deserters. Shortly afterward, the Ch'ing Government took a series of diplomatic measures.

First, the Ch'ing Government instructed Mengkote (孟额德), a Tahur leader (equivalent to deputy commander), guarding the Naowen River (along present-day Tsitsihar), to make initial contacts with the Russians. Twice (December 10, 1669 and April 15, 1670) Mengkote sent his subordinate Salan (沙兰) to Nipuchu to hold negotiations. When Salan went there for a second time, he brought with him an official note from the Chinese Ministry of Tribal Affairs in the name of Emperor K'ang Hsi and addressed to Arshinskiy. Besides protesting against the Cossacks' aggressive crimes, the note demanded that the Russians hand back Kentemur and other deserters and made it clear that in future "if your country has something to say to our country, it may send an envoy to hold talks with us."** This expressed the wish of the Chinese side to resolve the issue of Tsarist Russian Cossacks violating the Chinese frontier peacefully through diplomatic channels.

However, the Tsarist Russian Government not only had no sincerity to resolve the issue by peaceful means, but it mistook China's peace proposal as a sign of weakness. Arshinskiy, acting on the old Tsar's original instructions, sent as envoys his military officers including Milowanov (米洛万诺夫) to Peking to hand in a note full of frantic words asking China to "submit" itself to the Tsar's "supreme authority."*** Although this note was accepted by the Chinese side as an official note, both the Jesuit missionary who acted as interpreter and the Chinese minister responsible for the reception did not dare to report the truth to K'ang Hsi,

---

* Bandesh-Kamanskiy, op. cit., p. 17.

** Ibid., pp. 17-18; Russian-Chinese Relations in the 17th Century, Vol. 1, pp. 269-277, Russian edition.

*** Russian-Chinese Relations in the 17th Century, Vol. 1, pp. 270-271; Ancient Palace Historical Material in Russian, pp. 267-269.

but merely transmitted the Tsar's wish to be on friendly terms with the Chinese emperor. Accordingly, Milowanov and his entourage were still warmly received. However, when the Chinese side brought up the issues of Kentemur and the Cossack intrusion, Milowanov evaded them by confining himself to the note. As a result, the talks were fruitless.

The Ch'ing Government, misplacing its confidence in the Tsar's wish for friendly relations, thought that the two countries had a basis to settle the border issue peacefully, and decided to make further unilateral efforts. So, it sent a higher-ranking officer, Mengkote,to Nipuchu with a letter from emperor K'ang Hsi to the Tsar. In this letter dated June 29, 1670, K'ang Hsi denounced the Cossacks for killing "the Chulichis (i.e., the Nuchens, whom Russia called Kicher 吉切尔) and Tahurs" and demanded the return of Kentemur and other deserters. He reiterated: "Since it is the wish of Your Majesty to live in peace and friendship with us, it is only proper for you to hand back to us Kentemur and see to it that no trouble will be caused again along the border."* Mengkote also condemned in Arshinskiy's presence the various crimes committed by Chernigovskiy entrenched at Yaksa.** Arshinskiy thereupon promised to return Kentemur*** and indicated that he would issue an order prohibiting Cossacks at Yaksa from acting recklessly.+

But the Tsarist Russian side reneged from its promise. Kentemur and other deserters were not returned and the Cossacks remained as rampant as ever. From 1670 to 1672, Mengkote thrice went to Nipuchu to press for a reply from the Tsar to the Chinese letter of June 29, 1670, but to no avail. In August 1674, when the Chinese side asked Romanov (罗曼诺夫) and other merchants of Selengesk who had arrived at China to trade whether they had brought the Tsar's letter of reply, they answered in the negative.++ As certain historians explained, the reason why the Tsarist Government remained silent for a long time was: "Some of these letters (referring to letters sent out by China) never reached their destination, or were delivered to Moscow only years later."+++ But the fact was not so. As the historical

---

* Bandesh-Kamanskiy: Op. cit., pp. 20-21; Russian-Chinese Relations in the 17th Century, Vol. 1, p. 276.

** Bandesh-Kamanskiy: Op. cit., pp. 21; Russian-Chinese Relations in the 17th Century, Vol. 1, p. 280.

*** Bandesh-Kamanskiy: Op. cit., p. 33.

\+ "Strategy of Suppressing the Russians"; Russian-Chinese Relations in the 17th Century, Vol. 1, p. 280.

++ Bandesh-Kamanskiy: Op. cit., p. 23.

+++ G. Kahn (葛·加恩), Early History of Sino-Russian Relations, p. 8.

files of Tsarist Russia made public by the Soviet Union recently (carried in Russian-Chinese Relations in the 17th Century, Vol. 1) prove, as soon as these letters and notes were delivered to the Russian side, they were translated into Russian by the Russian local authorities and despatched to Moscow by special representatives.* It is therefore obvious that the Tsarist Russian Government had long understood the content of these letters and it only feigned ignorance.

In 1676, at a time when China was beset with "the rebellions by three princes," the Tsarist Russian Government sent a large delegation headed by Nichola Spafari (尼古拉·斯帕法里). The Ch'ing Government thought that the purpose of this mission was to reply to China's proposal and to hold talks on such questions as Tsarist Russia's incursion into Chinese territory and the deserters. Therefore it gave great attention to and warmly received this delegation. But such was not the purpose of the delegation. Of the 12 items on the agenda proposed by Spafari, none was concerned with the extradition of deserters and the cessation of Russian aggression, issues awaiting urgent solution. They were only related to the demand to open up trade. When the Ch'ing Government repeatedly pressed for an answer, Spafari still pretended that he had no knowledge of it and refused to answer. Spafari said the mission was to rebuild and improve relations between the two countries. Actually he not only refused to resolve the important issues hindering the friendly relations between the two countries, but tried to gather intelligence about China. He bought off foreign Jesuit members in China (such as Nan Huai Jen 南怀仁 and Hsü Jih Sheng 徐日升), and through them, collected intelligence about China's military, political and economic affairs. And Nan Huai Jen and others also proposed to him that Russia should take advantage of China's internal crisis and send an army to teach China "a lesson."**

What the Tsarist Russian Government had done could not be tolerated by the Ch'ing Government any longer. Then and there the Ch'ing Government put before Spafari the following demand: The Russian Cossacks must unconditionally withdraw from Chinese territory and the deserters such as Kentemur must be returned or else the Chinese Government will refuse to receive Russian envoys and suspend trade. Spafari was asked to report this truthfully to the Tsar.***

After Spafari returned to Russia, the Tsarist Russian Government still stuck to its own course of action and refused to respond to China's demands.

---

* Russian-Chinese Relations in the 17th Century, Vol. 1, Documents Nos. 135, 137, etc.

** Bandesh-Kamanskiy: Op. cit., pp. 33-35.

*** Ibid., pp. 33-34; Russian-Chinese Relations in the 17th Century, Vol. 2.

This is a brief account of the diplomatic negotiations between China and Russia prior to the outbreak of the Yaksa War. It shows that the two countries took diametrically different attitudes toward their bilateral relations. The Chinese side took active and positive action and did all it could to strive for a peaceful settlement. But the Tsarist Russian Government, harboring aggressive intent, encouraged the Cossacks to intrude and harass the Chinese frontier areas, while it itself feigned innocence. When it could no longer deceive people, it pretended to be deaf and dumb and stalled. But the court scholars of Soviet revisionism, acting on instructions of the Soviet revisionist renegade clique, come to the defense of the aggressive policies of the old Tsars and wilfully distort China's peace demands. They say nonsensically that such demands "were used to camouflage their war preparations."* Nevertheless, facts have exposed their clumsy tactics. History proves that it was the Tsarist Russian Government which resorted to trickery, deception, treachery and was intent on aggression and expansion, and now the men of letters in the employ of the Soviet revisionists are trying to put makeup on it!

More than a decade of diplomatic negotiations enabled the Ch'ing Government to recognize that relying on peace proposals alone could not solve practical problems in dealing with the aggressive Tsarist Russian Government. It was therefore forced to the following conclusion: "Unless they are punished by military might, they won't know the consequence but will go on making trouble. Therefore, we must take punitive actions."**

In short, due to the Tsarist Russian Government's insistence on invading China, the just war China was forced to wage against aggression broke out inevitably.

III. The Yaksa War Had the Support and Help of the People of All Nationalities in China

To distort the nature of the Yaksa War, the court scholars of the Soviet revisionists have cudgeled their brains to cook up all sorts of lies, asserting that the people of various nationalities along the banks of the Heilung River "basically did not submit" to the Ch'ing Government "any request for assistance or protection from persecution by the Russians." They "basically were unwilling to compromise with the rule established by the Manchus over the Amur River." "They escaped from Manchu control to retain as best they could their Russian citizenship."*** The lies cooked up by such scholars are designed vainly to prove that the people of various nationalities along the banks of the Heilung River had nothing to do with China, and that the military action taken by the Ch'ing Government to expel

---

* Mailihov, Op. cit.

** "Strategy of Suppressing the Russians."

*** Mailihov, Op. cit.

the Russian aggressors was "aggression" and "expansion" in violation of the wishes of the local populace. These are nothing but distortions of history, insults to the people of various nationalities of China along the banks of the Heilung River!

The people of various nationalities including the Solun, Tahur, Chiler, Hoche and Fiyak populating the areas along the Heilung River for generations have since ancient times been the members of the Chinese big family. They loved their mother country and their own land. The intrusion of armed bandits from Tsarist Russia into the Heilung River valley caused them to be brutally killed and plundered. To protect their own land, lives and property, they persisted in a relentless life-and-death struggle from the first day the armed bandits intruded into areas along the banks of the Heilung River. It is clearly recorded in Russian history that when the armed bandits of Tsarist Russia led by Khabarov intruded into the Heilung River valley, "the Tahurs resisted resolutely and refused to let the Cossacks set foot on their soil."* Even when the leaders of these nationalities were captured by the Tsarist Russians as hostages and tortured savagely, they still firmly answered the aggressors: "We'd rather be killed ourselves than our own people be killed."** Commenting on such courage of the Tahurs, Russian historians said: This was something that "never happened" in other places. "Usually, when a tribal chief was captured and held as hostage, the whole tribe would surrender and pay tribute and taxes. But the Tahurs rose and fought back. It may be said they did it for their own land and their own survival rather than for their own chieftains."+ It is also recorded in Russian official documents: "The Tahurs and Kichers attacked Albazin" and killed 12 aggressors outside the city.++ Even in modern times, legends still spread among the Fiyaks of downstream Heilung River about how they used a variety of ingenious means to punish the intruders -- the Cossacks from Tsarist Russia.+++ These historical records not only lay bare the lies the court scholars of Soviet revisionism have made up about the people of various nationalities inhabiting the banks of the Heilung River that "they escaped from Manchu control" and "pledged allegiance" to Russia, but they also fully reflect the heroic spirit of the people of the various nationalities living in that part of China in waging a life-and-death struggle against external aggressors.

---

* Vashiliyev(瓦西里耶夫), "Outer Baikal Cossacks," Vol. 1, p. 67, 1916 Russian edition.

** Bakhlushen(巴赫鲁申), "Cossacks on the Heilung River," 1925 Russian edition.

\+ Sadouvnikov (萨道夫尼科夫), Our New Land Discoverers, p. 96, 1905 Russian edition.

++ Russian-Chinese Relations in the 17th Century, Vol. 1, No. 132.

+++ See also Schenburg (施捷恩别尔格), Kiriak (基里尔克), Oloch (奥洛奇), Gort (果尔特), Nejidar (涅吉达尔), Ainu (爱奴), pp. 295-297, Russian edition.

The great leader Chairman Mao says: "All the nationalities of China have resisted foreign oppression and have invariably resorted to rebellion to shake it off." ("The Chinese Revolution and the Chinese Communist Party") The Yaksa War was conducted precisely under conditions in which the people of various nationalities inhabiting the Heilung River areas strongly demanded to be freed from external aggression. After the armed bandits of Tsarist Russia intruded into the upstream region of the Heilung River, people of China's Solun nationality "were often killed and robbed of their mink and other property," and they "lodged an appeal listing the crimes committed by the Russians."* In his letter of June 29, 1670 to the Russian Tsar, K'ang Hsi also mentioned: "It has been reported by hunters back from their rounds at the Shilka River that in the Albazin area at the river mouth there is a small band of Russians .... who wantonly attack my frontier subjects -- the Tahurs and Kichers."** Appeals and warnings by the people of various nationalities inhabiting the banks of the Heilung River made the Ch'ing emperor K'ang Hsi realize that if the armed bandits "are not swiftly removed, the people living in the frontier areas will have no peace and security."*** Hence the decision to hit back. It was also admitted by early Soviet historical works that the first thing the Tsarist Russian Cossacks came upon after they intruded into the Heilung River valley was the resistance of the local people of various nationalities. When later they saw that they alone were powerless to expel these aggressors, they "turned their eyes to their sole natural protector" -- their "supreme ruler, the Emperor of China."+ Today the court scholars of Soviet revisionism are blind and deaf to these clear historical records, and even have the nerve to say that the people of various nationalities inhabiting the banks of the Heilung River basically did not submit to the Ch'ing Government "any demand for assistance or protection against Russian persecution," and did not even drop a "small hint."++ Such nonsense, in truth, is meant to deny the subordinate relationship of the people of various nationalities inhabiting the Heilung River valley to the Ch'ing Government, so that they can defend the crimes of aggression committed by the old Tsars against China and serve the expansionist policies of Soviet revisionist social-imperialism. Nevertheless, lies written in ink cannot cover up ironclad historical facts!

The areas along the Heilung River have been Chinese territory since ancient times, and the people of various nationalities there have always been masters of China. In the 17th century, the Ch'ing Government was the feudal

---

* Liu Hsien-t'ing (刘献廷), "Kuangyang Miscellaneous Notes."

** Russian-Chinese Relations in the 17th Century, p. 276.

*** "Strategy of Suppressing the Russians."

\+ Bakhlushen: Op. cit.

++ Mailihov: Op. Cit.

ruler and its relationship with the people of various nationalities was that between the ruler and the ruled. However, the Yaksa War which the Ch'ing Government conducted in defense against Tsarist Russian aggression conformed to the interests of the people of all nationalities in China and had their support. When the Ch'ing Government made the decision to repel the Tsarist Russian aggression with force and moved its troops to the areas along the Heilung River, the people of various nationalities there were greatly inspired. Wherever the Ch'ing army went, there was always the moving scene in which "the local people cheered and offered it gifts as the Ch'ing army marched across the vast plains and rugged mountains."* The local people also took up arms to fight alongside the Ch'ing troops. In 1683, led by Hsilukonu (奚鲁固奴), the Kichers inhabiting along the Niuman River fought a bloody battle with a gang of Tsarist Russian bandits being pursued by the Ch'ing army, and killed more than a dozen enemies. Then with their wives and children, they went over to the Ch'ing army. Led by Churkeng (朱尔铿格), the Olunchuns that inhabited along the Chingchili River resisted the extortion of the Tsarist Russian aggressors for contributions, and killed 5 enemies and captured their firearms in a battle. The Fiyaks who settled in the lower reaches of the Heilung River also fought repeatedly with the intruding Tsarist Russian aggressors.** By 1685, as a result of coordinated actions by the army and people, except for those entrenched at Yaksa, all other Tsarist Russian aggressors in the valley were wiped out.

When the Ch'ing government troops were preparing for an attack on Yaksa held by the Tsarist Russian aggressors, the people of various nationalities along the Heilung River plunged still more actively into this anti-aggression war. They took part in everything from building fortresses and courier stations to constructing ships and hauling provisions. They also bravely infiltrated into the enemy's rear on reconnaissance missions. The deputy superintendent of the Tahurs, Peiler (倍勒儿), and the deputy supreintendent of the Soluns, Umupurtai (乌木布尔代), for example, led warriors of their own tribes deep into the enemy's rear, where they captured prisoners and reconnoitered enemy conditions. In an unexpected encounter with the enemies, Peiler repelled them and took 7 of them, including Kawalila (喝瓦力喇).+ Some local inhabitants even went into the enemy fortresses and taking advantage of the enemy's greed, gathered information under the guise of paying taxes in kind.++ During the Yaksa War, 500 Tahurs joined the army to fight. The various military leaders of the

---

* Wu Chao-ch'ien (吴兆骞), Collections of the Autumn Leaf Whistle, Vol. 3, "With General Pata on His Eastern Expedition."

** The above-mentioned examples are from "Strategy of Suppressing the Russians"; see also Factual Records of Ch'ing, Stories of Ancestors of Heishui and other works.

\+ "Strategy of Suppressing the Russians."

++ Bakhlushen, Op. cit.

Solun tribes made outstanding contributions in keeping the courier routes open and producing enough military supplies and food. To coordinate with the Yaksa War, the Mongols also staged an offensive against the Tsarist Russians entrenched at Selengesk, killing many of them, with the result that they "dared not step out of the fortress."* Taking part in the Yaksa War were also the naval units and rattan-shield infantry of the Han people from such faraway provinces as Fukien, Shantung, Shansi, Honan and Kansu. On the front along the northeast border area, they fought courageously and contributed to the defense of the frontier. All this indicates that the people of all nationalities throughout China were determined to expel the foreign aggressors.

The battle siege of Yaksa city began in June 1685. Before the assault began, the Ch'ing army had a letter delivered to the Tsarist Russian aggressors entrenched in Yaksa, demanding that they leave the Chinese territory. When this was ignored, the Ch'ing army attacked. After bitter fighting, the city walls were smashed, and a quarter of the enemies were killed. All others surrendered. The Ch'ing army ordered them to return to their own country and not to come back to Yaksa again. However, these Tsarist Russian aggressors, after they were released, broke the agreement and joined force with Tsarist Russian reinforcements on the way. As the Ch'ing army was withdrawing from Yaksa, they came back again and attempted to re-take Yaksa and continue their aggressive and expansionist activities. In July 1686, the Ch'ing army was obliged to turn north again to deal with the enemies occupying Yaksa. After about six months' siege, only about a hundred Tsarist Russian aggressors survived, short of ammunition and food. The Tsarist Russian Government finally accepted the fact that its ambition to intrude and occupy the areas along the Heilung River in China was difficult to achieve, so, in response to the peace proposals of the Chinese Government, it sent an envoy to Nipuchu to hold talks with the Chinese counter-part. In order to stabilize its rule in the south, smash the deal between Tsarist Russia and Galden of the Dzungaria tribe, and safeguard the northern frontier, the Ch'ing Government hoped to conclude a treaty with Russia at an early date even at the cost of ceding territory. Finally in 1689, China and Russia signed the "Nipuchu Treaty." According to its terms, China recovered Yaksa.

The reason why the well-known Yaksa War was supported and participated in from start to finish by the people of all nationalities in China was that it reflected their common desire to oppose foreign aggression and oppression and to defend the territorial integrity of their fatherland. Particularly, the people of various nationalities inhabiting the areas along the Heilung River for generations suffered most under the heels of the Tsarist Russian aggressors, so their demand for resisting aggression was the strongest and they were the most courageous and resolute in striking at the enemies. They contributed tremendously to the anti-aggression struggle with both manpower and materials, winning indelible merit in the defense of their fatherland. Their heroic image cannot be demeaned by the court scholars of the Soviet revisionists, nor can their great deeds be tampered with or blotted out.

---

* Bandesh-Kamanskiy, Op. cit., p. 38.

The great revolutionary teacher Lenin pointed out: "For several hundred years, the Tsarist Government has plundered and oppressed other nations more savagely than any other dictatorial devil. It not only oppresses the great Russian nation but also causes it to degenerate into an executioner slaughtering other nations." ("Tasks of the Proletariat in the Revolution of Our Country") This brilliant thesis of Lenin's pronounced a harsh judgment on the aggressive and evil Tsarist Government. Today, the Soviet revisionist renegade clique and its court scholars have gone so far as to forsake Lenin's teachings, reverse the historical verdict on the old Tsars, distort the nature of the Yaksa War, and glorify the old Tsars. This precisely exposes them as a flock of great Russian chauvinists and expansionists prostrating themselves at the feet of the Tsars.

* * *

END

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
National Technical Information Service
Springfield, Va. 22161

OFFICIAL BUSINESS

PRINTED MATTER

AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY EMPLOYER

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
COM-211

U.S. MAIL

CMP X761231 001
UNIV ILLINOIS LIB AT CHICAGO CIRCLE
LIB SERIALS SEC
BOX 8198
CHICAGO IL 60680